Appl. No.: 10/774,879 Amdt. dated May 21, 2007

Reply to Office Action of January 23, 2007

Claims 1 to 5 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Winston in view of Burt US 1,718,997. This same prior art was considered by the Examiner in the parent application, wherein the Examiner concluded that the method claims were novel and non-obvious over this prior art. Referring more specifically to the prior art, the Winton reference simply describes the conventional composition of cheese and milk products. However, this reference does not teach or suggest a molded food product of the structure defined in the claims.

The Burt reference discloses <u>frozen</u> confections, such as popsicles, and discloses that these products can have a coating. However, there is no disclosure or suggestion of <u>molded creamy or crumbly cheese products</u> or of a <u>non-frozen</u> milk product as claimed. The cheese and non frozen milk products claimed by applicants are obviously not frozen dairy products. Clearly, the Burt products are maintained in a <u>frozen</u> state rather than a <u>non-frozen</u> state

Nothing in the Winton and Burt references would provide a motivation for persons skilled in the art to produce a molded product formed from cheese or non-frozen milk products.

Applicants have provided a process that renders a food product formed from cheese or non-frozen milk products moldable, namely the product can be molded into a predetermined dimensional shape, which allows, after the product has been unmolded, to apply a coating that imparts to it mechanical strength and/or non-stick properties.

Since the product of the present invention was not manufacturable with prior art techniques, but only with the process that is described in the present application and its parent, which is patented as U.S. Patent No. 6,821,544 as noted above, an obviousness rejection based on the combined teachings of Winston and Burt is clearly improper. The process taught by Burt cannot lead to the claimed product.

For these reasons, claims 1 to 5 are patentable over the prior art. Reconsideration by the Examiner and withdrawal of the rejection are solicited.

Appl. No.: 10/774,879 Amdt. dated May 21, 2007

Reply to Office Action of January 23, 2007

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper.

However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,

Raymond O. Linker, Jr. Registration No. 26,419

Customer No. 00826 ALSTON & BIRD LLP Bank of America Plaza 101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000 Charlotte, NC 28280-4000 Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1101 Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON May 21, 2007.